LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 1 1968
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1968.

No, 546.

JAMES R. HOFFA, THOMAS EWING PARKS and
LARRY CAMPBELL,
Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent.

PETITIONERS' REPLY.

MORRIS A. SHENKER,
408 Olive Street,
St. Louis, Missouri 63102,
Counsel for Petitioner Hoffa.

JACQUES M. SCHIFFER,
46 Andover Road,
Rockville Center,
Long Island, New York,
Counsel for Petitioner Parks.

CECIL D. BRANSTETTER,
216 Third Avenue, North,
Nashville, Tennessee,
Counsel for Petitioner Campbell.

Of Counsel:

DANIEL B. MAHER,
1001 Connecticut,
Washington, D. C.

ST. LOUIS LAW PRINTING CO., INC., 411-15 N. Eighth St., 63101. CEntral 1-4477.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1968.

No. 546.

JAMES R. HOFFA, THOMAS EWING PARKS and LARRY CAMPBELL,
Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent.

PETITIONERS' REPLY.

In its Brief in Opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari, the Government states that, in light of this Court's decision in **Kolod v. United States**, 390 U. S. 136 (1968), it now wishes to disclose that it monitored by electronic surveillance an undisclosed number of conversations in which two of the petitioners participated.

This amazing disclosure is now made to this Court for the first time, after almost twenty months of petitioners' incarceration, and although the Government in its "Memorandum for the United States in Opposition to Petitioners' Motion for Relief" in this Court's original review of this case (Nos. 32-35, O. T. 1966) stated that petitioners' allegations of electronic eavesdropping were "without foundation in fact." The Government also stated at that time that its review of its files did not support a claim that "electronic eavesdropping or wiretapping affected petitioners' convictions."

Under these extraordinary circumstances, petitioners urge that this Court should grant their petition for a writ of certiorari, and should set aside the judgments of conviction rendered below on March 12, 1964. Only such a ruling by this Court will serve as a deterrent to the government against similar affronts to the fairness of federal law enforcement. In this respect, petitioners respectfully refer the Court to the allegations set out in detail in their Motion to Set Aside the Judgments of Conviction, and the supporting brief, being filed simultaneously with this reply.

Respectfully submitted,

MORRIS A. SHENKER,
408 Olive Street,
St. Louis, Missouri 63102,
Counsel for Petitioner
Hoffa,

JACQUES M. SCHIFFER,
46 Andover Road,
Rockville Center,
Long Island, New York,
Counsel for Petitioner
Parks,

CECIL D. BRANSTETTER,
216 Third Avenue, North,
Nashville, Tennessee,
Counsel for Petitioner
Campbell.

Of Counsel:
DANIEL B. MAHER,
1001 Connecticut,
Washington, D. C.